

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in the application. Claim 14 has been added. Claims 1-14 accordingly are pending in the application.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Autor, et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0065751), in view of Richards, et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0097422). Applicant traverses these rejections and submits that the claims are patentably distinct over the cited references.

Claim 1 recites as follows:

1. A modular computer system comprising at least one service processor module and a plurality of information processing modules, each having a predetermined IP address, removably received in a modular computer system housing, wherein the service processor module is operable in receipt of a naming command message from an external management entity **to assign a name to each service processor module and each information processing module** *according to a format specified in the naming command message*, and to transmit a message to an external domain name server indicating the IP address of each service processor module and each information processing module and the name assigned to each respective module.

The Examiner alleges that Autor teaches the non-underlined portions of claim 1 as shown above, but does not contend that Autor teaches the underlined portions of claim 1. *See* Office Action at paragraph 5. Applicant agrees that Autor does not teach or suggest the underlined portions of claim 1. Applicant submits, however, that Autor includes at least two further differences from claim 1, indicated by the bolded and italicized portions of claim 1 shown above.

First, Autor does not teach or suggest “receipt of a naming command message ... to assign a name to each service processor module and each information processing module” as in claim 1. Instead, Autor is directed to “a method for propagating **a rack name** within a computer

server rack,” so that “[i]f a server goes down or otherwise needs attention, a system administrator may remotely query the server for its location thereby allowing the administrator to find the server.” Autor (Abstract) and ¶ [0006]. As such, Autor’s server rack is a “mounting rack to which server or power supply chassis and standard laboratory equipment are mounted.” *Id.* at ¶ [0024]. This rack is distinct from a “service processor module” or “information processing module” as Fig. 1 of Autor illustrates a rack 100 that contains “front end servers 150, application servers 160, back-end servers 170 and power supplies 180.” *Id.* at ¶ [0025]. For this reason, Autor cannot be said to teach or suggest assigning a name to anything less granular than a server rack, much less to “*each* service processor module and *each* information processing module” as in claim 1.

Second, Autor’s assigning of server rack names is not performed “according to a format specified in the naming command message” as in claim 1. The Examiner points to the fact that “[t]he rack name is preferably stored...as a binary representation of an ASCII word or phrase.” Autor ¶ [0031]. The manner in which Autor’s rack name is *stored* says nothing about whether the naming command message *itself* “specifie[s]” a “format,” as is recited in claim 1. Autor does not teach or suggest this feature.

Autor’s system therefore differs significantly from the system of claim 1, as indicated by the bolded, italicized, and underlined portions of claim 1 shown above.

The Examiner cites Richards to remedy the deficiencies of Autor. As a threshold matter, however, because Richards is alleged only to suggest the underlined portions of claim 1 shown above, the Examiner does not suggest that Richards teaches or suggests the bolded or italicized portions of claim 1. Because Autor does not teach or suggest these features either (as discussed above), it follows that the proposed combination of Autor and Richards does not teach or suggest assigning a name to “each service processor module and each information processing module” or “according to a format specified in the naming command message” as in claim 1. The Examiner therefore has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to 1 for at least this reason. *See* MPEP § 2143.03.

Furthermore, Richards does not teach or suggest the features of claim 1 alleged by the Examiner. Richards is directed to “the automatic distribution, installation, and monitoring of operating systems and application software on computers linked to a network from a remote location.” Richards ¶ [0001]. To this end, customers in Richards’ system submit installation

requests in the form of service orders. *See id.* at ¶¶ [0037] and [0038]. These service orders contain customer configuration information necessary for installation such as “Internet Protocol (IP) data including the Host names, IP address, gateway, DNS and DHCP.” *See id.* at ¶¶ [0047] and [0048]. The Examiner places great emphasis on the fact that Richards mentions the term DNS. Richards, however, is interested only in obtaining customer configuration information and thus has no reason to teach or suggest “transmit[ing] a message to an external domain name server indicating [an] IP address ...and [a] name,” as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, Richards does not teach or suggest a “service processor module” or “information processing modules,” because Richards is not concerned with modular computer systems. Accordingly, Richards cannot be said to teach or suggest “transmit[ing] a message to an external domain name server indicating the IP address of each service processor module and each information processing module and the name assigned to each respective module.” For these further reasons, the proposed combination of Autor and Richards fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *See* MPEP § 2143.03.

For at least the reasons stated above, claim 1 (and therefore its dependent claims) are believed to be patentably distinct over the cited references. The remaining claims are believed to be patentably distinct over the cited art for at least reasons similar to those provided above for claim 1.

CONCLUSION:

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

Applicant has petitioned herewith for what is believed to be the appropriate extension of time. If any further extensions are necessary to prevent the above-referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-85500/DMM.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 1, 2008

By: /Dean M. Munyon/
Dean M. Munyon
Reg. No. 42,914

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P. O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767
(512) 853-8847